

and Fishes had also been made by those gentlemen, but that it was unfortunately spoiled, after its arrival at Mauritius, by the dishonesty of a native servant, who had abstracted the spirit in which the specimens had been preserved.

The following papers were read :—

1. NOTICE OF A SPECIES OF *LASIURUS* SENT FROM THE SANDWICH ISLANDS BY MR. W. H. PEASE. BY DR. J. E. GRAY, F.R.S.

I have just received from Mr. W. H. Pease a specimen of *Lasiurus* or Hairy-tailed Bat, with the following observation, dated Honolulu, Nov. 20, 1861 :—“ I have the pleasure of sending you a specimen of the Bat found on our islands, also a skull separate. It is the only mammal indigenous to our group (of islands). It is quite a curiosity to our natives, very few of them having ever seen one.”

I have carefully compared the specimen sent by Mr. Pease with the *Lasiuri* in the British Museum, which have been named by Mr. Robert Tomes in conformity with his paper on the species of the genus, printed in the ‘Proceedings of the Zoological Society’ for 1857.

I cannot find any distinction between it and the specimen named *Lasiurus grayii*, described in his paper. (See P. Z. S. 1857, p. 40.)

The Museum specimen was received from Mr. Bridges, who obtained it in Chili.

There is a second specimen in the Museum Collection named by Mr. R. Tomes *L. grayi*, which was collected by Mr. John E. Goodsir at Nasqually, Juan de Fuca. I may observe that the Sandwich Islands specimen is of the same size as the specimen from Chili, and considerably smaller than the one from Juan de Fuca, which has the arm-bone nearly a line and a half longer than the Chilian and Sandwich Islands specimens.

This Bat being found in the Sandwich Islands is curious, as showing the similarity of the fauna in some particulars with that of the Western Coast of America.

2. NOTICE OF A NEW SPECIES OF DOLPHIN (*DELPHINUS CATALANIA*), DISCOVERED IN NORTH AUSTRALIA BY MR. JOHN MACGILLIVRAY. BY DR. J. E. GRAY, F.R.S., ETC.

Mr. John Macgillivray has sent to Mr. Cuming, who has transferred them to the British Museum Collection, two skulls of a species of Dolphin or Bottlenose, which he regards as probably new.

These skulls were accompanied by the following notes :—

“ *DELPHINUS*, n. s.

“ *The larger of the two* skulls belonged to an individual killed off Cape Melville (within the Great Barrier Reefs), north-east coast of Australia, Sept. 5, 1860. It was a *female*, $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet in length ; and

from it were taken two foetuses, each 10 inches in length. The adult was of a very light lead-colour above and on the sides, gradually passing into the dirty leaden white of the lower parts, which were covered (as also the flippers) with longitudinally elongated blotches of dark lead-colour.

“The smaller of the two skulls represents another Porpoise of the same species, harpooned off Cape Flattery, on the north-east coast of Australia, Oct. 9, 1860. It was considerably smaller than the first one, being only $6\frac{3}{4}$ feet in length. It was a *female*. The colour was *exactly* lead-colour, fading into whitish on the lower parts between the anus and the snout. The sides were marked with small oblong spots of the same colour as the back. Measurements when recent :—

“Total length, snout to centre of tail, 6 feet 9 inches.

“Snout to base of dorsal, 3 feet ; length of anterior border of dorsal 13 inches ; height of dorsal 8 inches ; width of dorsal 12 inches ; from posterior border of dorsal to tip of tail, 2 feet 8 inches.

“Swimming-paws (midway between snout and dorsal) 13 inches long, and $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches broad ; from their base to end of snout, 13 inches.

“Tail 22 inches across from tip to tip.

“Anus 2 feet 2 inches in front of tail (centre of tip).

“Eye $\frac{3}{4}$ ths of an inch in diameter, situated $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch behind angle of mouth, and 12 inches from tip of upper jaw.

“Lower jaw projecting 1 inch beyond the upper.

“This Porpoise was occasionally seen, in small droves of from three to six, along the north-east coast of Australia, within the reefs. Two other species also were seen, but we could not fasten.”

The two skulls slightly differ in shape and size.

No. 1 is 17 inches long ; the beak to the notch is 10 inches, and the upper teeth-bone $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches long ; the front lower teeth are worn away and truncated, like the teeth of the common *Delphinus tursio*, which was described as *D. brunatus* by Montague. There are twenty-seven teeth on each side in the upper, and twenty-five teeth on each side in the lower jaw.

No. 2 is 17 inches long ; the beak $9\frac{1}{2}$, and the upper tooth-bone 8 inches long. The teeth, twenty-four above (perhaps one on each side is deficient, as the end of the jaw is very tender), twenty-three or twenty-four below. The front lower teeth are slightly truncated ; but this skull chiefly differs from No. 1 in being rather more convex and rather narrower, especially in the hinder part, from the middle of its length.

I have compared these skulls with those of the different species of Bottlenoses (*Tursio*) in the British Museum ; and they are perfectly distinct from any of them. The species may be called *Delphinus catalania*. It is smaller in size, and has a much smaller brain-cavity than *D. cymodice* (Gray, Zool. Erebus & Terror, t. 19) and *D. metis* (Gray, Zool. Erebus & Terror, t. 18) ; and the beak is not so tapering as in these species, and the teeth are rather more numerous.

It is equally distinct from *Delphinus eurynome* (Gray, Zool. Erebus & Terror, t. 17), believed to be from the North Sea.

It is not easy to point out the distinction of these species in words; but there cannot be a doubt about them when they are compared together.

I may here observe that *Delphinus eutropia* (Gray, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1849, 1; Zool. Erebus & Terror, t. 34 ined.), which, in the 'Catalogue of Cetacea' in the British Museum, I have placed in the first section of *Tursia*, with *D. tursio* and the species above named, should be formed into a section of itself, characterized by having a very broad muzzle shelving on the sides, and the skull shelving down over the orbits, and thirty-four or thirty-five slender teeth on each side of each jaw. This section may be called EUTROPIA.

3. NOTICE OF A WINGLESS BIRD, OR MOHO, AND A RAVEN FOUND IN THE ISLAND OF HAWAII BY MR. W. H. PEASE. BY DR. J. E. GRAY, F.R.S., ETC.

In a note lately received from Mr. W. H. Pease, dated Honolulu, Nov. 20, 1861, he observes, "I noticed in a late number of the 'Annals of Natural History' a description of a species of bird living in our islands (which was figured many years since in Dixon's 'Voyage'), by Mr. Gould; he refers it to the genus '*Moho*.'

"Please inform him that there is a *wingless bird* of small size living in the island of Hawaii, which the natives call '*Moho*,' which is now nearly extinct, having been killed off by the wild cats and dogs within late years; I have seen but a single specimen. 'There is also living there a species of Raven.'

4. SOME REMARKS ON *AQUILA DESMURSII* (J. VERREAUX). BY J. H. GURNEY, M.P., F.Z.S.*

M. Jules Verreaux, who first recognized this Eagle as a distinct species, communicated his description of it to Dr. Hartlaub, by whom the species was made known to ornithologists in his admirable work on the Ornithology of West Africa.

My present object is to put on record some information as to this interesting bird, with which M. Jules Verreaux has been so good as to supply me, and also to give some indications of the changes of plumage to which this species appears liable, and which I have had the opportunity of examining in several examples which now form part of the collection of the Norwich Museum.

It may, however, be well to premise a few general remarks with reference to the geographical distribution of this Eagle, and to some of the peculiarities by which it is distinguished.

Aquila desmursii has hitherto only been found in Tropical Africa, north of the Equator,—specimens having been obtained at Bissao

* This paper will also be published in the Society's 'Transactions,' accompanied by a plate.